

4. Identification of principal proposed amendments: None

5. Brief Identification of principal arguments:

Applicant presented how Applicant's invention permits a user to *simultaneously view the data representative of the usage and any other website*, as described in the claims amended in the RCE filed on April 18, 2008. Applicant then presented how neither Hoyer nor Smith are directed to the invention since they fail to teach sending information on usage data such that it can be simultaneously viewed by the user.

6. Indication of other pertinent matters discussed:

The Applicant and the Examiner also discussed the nature of Applicant's invention, and the Applicant specifically pointed out how the invention pertains to monitoring usage data in a separate monitor window that is viewable while the user is also browsing the Internet on a different website. The Applicant cited to p. 9, lines 4-10 and Fig. 4 to support these points.

7. Results of Interview:

Examiner understood the invention with regard to the use of the monitor window and indicated that the Applicant made good arguments distinguishing Smith and Hoyer. The Examiner agreed to take these arguments into consideration when reviewing the recently filed RCE.

It is respectfully submitted that the instant STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §§1.2 and 1.133 and MPEP §713.04.

It is believed that no petition or fee is required. However, if the USPTO deems otherwise, Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee, except for the Issue Fee, for such extension is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott H. Davison/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (650) 625-8100
Facsimile: (650) 625-8110

Scott H. Davison
Registration No. 52,800

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 18, 2008